

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-34 are pending, of which Claims 31-34 are withdrawn; Claims 1, 4 and 5 are amended; Claim 3 is canceled; and no claims are newly added herewith. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-11, 15-17, and 22-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chapman et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,522,421, hereafter Chapman) in view of Shen (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0187951); and Claims 12-14 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chapman in view of Shen and further in view of Weiser (U.S. Pat. No. 5,920,404).

With regard to the outstanding rejection of Claims 1-11, 15-17, and 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chapman in view of Shen, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

said control unit stores the data of the email including the first identifier in said private accumulation unit to control said printout unit to print the data corresponding to the first identifier at the local site by reading the data from said private accumulation unit if the second identifier matches the first identifier, and

storage data of the email failing to include the first identifier in said output accumulation unit to control said printout unit to print the data stored in said output accumulation unit at the local site immediately after the storing of the data in said output accumulation unit.

According to amended Claim 1, the accumulation unit includes a private communication unit and an output accumulation unit. The control unit stores data of the email including a first identifier in the private accumulation unit for identifier matching based

printing, and stores data of emails failing to include the first identifier in the output accumulation unit for immediate printing.

The outstanding Office Action admits at page 2 that Chapman does not disclose or suggest the claimed input unit which receives a second identifier entered by the user through direct operation thereof. The outstanding Office Action attempts to remedy this admitted deficiency of Chapman by relying upon Shen.

Shen describes that the system includes receiving an email address, a user ID, and a password corresponding to an email account, displaying the list of one or more documents stored in the email account, retrieving a document from the email account, and printing the document.¹ However, both Chapman and Shen, alone and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest switching accumulation units depending on whether an identifier is included in an email.

Namely, Chapman uses information to send a message including information such as finishing options requested and used, pages printed, job completion or cancellation status to the user at the email message provided in the print request.² Chapman certainly does not disclose or suggest distinguishing between jobs to be immediately printed and jobs to be printed only after a second identification information is entered by a user.

Likewise, Shen does not disclose or suggest distinguishing between print jobs based upon the provision of an email identifier. Shen especially does not disclose or suggest distinguishing between jobs to be immediately printed and jobs to be printed only after second identification information is entered by a user.

Accordingly, as neither Chapman nor Shen, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the features recited in independent Claim 1, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection of Claims 1-11, 15-17, and 22-30 be withdrawn.

¹ Shen, Abstract.

² Chapman, col. 3, lines 45-47.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that there is no basis in the teachings of either of Shen or Chapman to support the applied combination. Certainly, the outstanding Office Action fails to cite to any specific teachings within either Shen or Chapman to support this combination. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the applied combination of Chapman with Shen is the result of hindsight reconstruction in view of the teachings of the present specification, and is improper.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 12-14 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chapman in view of Shen and further in view of Weiser, that rejection is also respectfully traversed.


As noted above, the combination of Chapman and Shen fails to provide a *prima facie* case obviousness with respect to independent Claim 1, from which Claims 12-14 and 18-21 depend. Because Weiser is not relied upon to provide the deficiencies above-identified with regard to the combination of Chapman and Shen, Weiser is not substantively addressed herewith.

Thus, as the applied combination of references does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and present amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Katherine P. Barecchia
Registration No. 50,607